

ON THE ASYMPTOTIC STABILITY OF STATIONARY SOLUTIONS OF THE INVISCID INCOMPRESSIBLE POROUS MEDIUM EQUATION

TAREK M. ELGINDI

ABSTRACT. We initiate the study of stability of solutions of the 2D inviscid incompressible porous medium equation (IPM). We begin by classifying all stationary solutions of the inviscid IPM under mild conditions. We then prove some linear stability results. We then study solutions of the IPM equation which are sufficiently regular perturbations of linearly stable steady states. We prove that sufficiently regular perturbations which are also small must be globally regular and strongly converge to a steady state. The mechanism behind the stability is *stratification* as opposed to previous stability results based on dispersion and/or mixing [1]. More or less, we prove that stratified stationary solutions which do not go against gravity are asymptotically stable.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Well-posedness for active scalar equations. The question of well-posedness for active scalar equations is one which has attracted much attention in the last several years. One of the breakthroughs in the study of active scalar equations was the proof(s) of well-posedness for the 2-D critically viscous Surface Quasi-Geostrophic (SQG) equations. A proof of wellposedness was discovered by Kiselev, Nazarov, and Volberg using their “modulus of continuity method” [19]. Around the same time, Caffarelli and Vasseur proved the well-posedness for SQG by extending De Giorgi’s method for non-linear elliptic equations to non-local equations [3]. Another proof was discovered by Constantin and Vicol using their “Nonlinear Maximum Principle” [10].

All of these proofs have yielded the PDE community a wide variety of methods to approach fluid equations with critical dissipation. In a sense, the results of [19], [3], and [10] allow one to say that virtually any active scalar equation with critical dissipation and divergence-free velocity field is well-posed. In the supercritical case, however, the situation is very different. At the time of the writing of this paper, there

are little or no results on the global existence of strong solutions to “supercritical” active scalar equations. For the inviscid SQG equation, for example, the question of global existence vs. finite time blow-up of strong solutions is currently wide open with the exception of local results or different kinds of blow-up criteria [9],[24], [18].

1.2. The question of long-time behavior. Yet another major gap in our understanding of fluid models lies in questions related to the long-time behavior of solutions of models we know to be globally well-posed. A good example of this is the 2D Euler equations. On the one hand, there is the landmark result of Kiselev and Sverak [20] on the growth of solutions of the 2D Euler equations in a bounded domain. The intuition behind Kiselev and Sverak’s construction is that a certain singular steady state of the Euler equations is stable. This stable steady state destabilizes smooth solutions which are close to it in some sense and lead to double exponential growth. On the other end of the spectrum is the recent resolution of the stability of the Couette flow for 2D Euler by Bedrossian and Masmoudi [1]. Bedrossian and Masmoudi’s main result is that a certain linearly stable steady state of the Euler equations is *asymptotically stable*. The mechanism behind the stability is that the linearized Euler equations around the Couette flow exhibit certain damping properties. Bedrossian and Masmoudi are able to take advantage of these damping properties to prove that “very smooth” perturbations of the Couette flow which are small in a particular Gevrey class converge back to a shear flow stationary solution of the Euler equations. A related result in plasma physics was achieved earlier by Mouhot and Villani [22] and then simplified and strengthened by Bedrossian, Masmoudi, and Mouhot [2]. One can say that, for the result of [1], the main idea is that *mixing can be a stabilizing force*.

In this article, the main idea is that *stratification can be a stabilizing force*. One can imagine that a fluid with density that is proportional to depth (i.e. that the density of the fluid increases the deeper you go into the fluid) is, in some sense, “stable.” On the other hand, if the density is inversely proportional to depth, then one would imagine that such a scenario is unstable—indeed this is where one sees the so-called Rayleigh-Darcy convection or Rayleigh-Benard convection even in the presence of viscosity [11].

We are concerned mainly with the stable case. The question we wish to ask here is whether (in the absence of viscosity), one is able to establish non-linear stability results for (1.1)-(1.3). We will show that this is indeed the case. In fact, we will be able to prove that smooth perturbations of stratified stable solutions are stable for all time in Sobolev spaces.

We emphasize that this seems to be the first construction of a non-trivial global smooth solution for the inviscid IPM equation.

1.3. The inviscid IPM equation. The system we study is the inviscid IPM equation:

$$(1.1) \quad \frac{\mu}{\kappa} u = -\nabla p - (0, g\rho),$$

$$(1.2) \quad \partial_t \rho + u \cdot \nabla \rho = 0,$$

$$(1.3) \quad \operatorname{div}(v) = 0$$

u is the velocity of the fluid, p is the pressure, μ is the dynamic viscosity, κ is the permeability of the isotropic medium, ρ is the liquid density and g is the gravitational acceleration. When these equations are studied on a bounded domain, we assume that u satisfies the no-slip boundary condition:

$$u \cdot n = 0,$$

on the boundary of the domain where n is the normal to the boundary.

Our goal here is to study the (non-linear) stability of exact solutions to this system. For simplicity, let's take $\mu = \kappa$ and $g = -1$.

We note that this system can also be written as follows:

$$\partial_t \rho + u \cdot \nabla \rho = 0$$

$$u = R_1 R^\perp \rho$$

where $R^\perp = (R_2, -R_1)$ and R_1, R_2 are the Riesz transforms and this is exactly the same as the SQG system except that $u = R^\perp \rho$ in that case.

1.4. The steady states. The kinds of exact solutions we are interested in are: $\rho = f(y)$, $u = 0$, and $p = 0$. It is trivial to check that these are stationary solutions for any C^1 function, f .

In fact, under mild assumptions, these are the only stationary solutions.

Lemma 1.1. *Let ρ be a C^1 stationary solution of the inviscid IPM equation on a bounded domain Ω or in $\mathbb{R}^2$. If we are studying the equation on $\mathbb{R}^2$, we also assume that $|\rho(x, y)| \lesssim \frac{1}{x^2+y^2+1}$. Then, ρ is a function of y only and, in particular, $u \equiv 0$.*

Proof. We know that

$$u \cdot \nabla \rho = 0$$

This means that

$$\int u \cdot \nabla \rho y = 0.$$

Due to the assumption on the decay of ρ in the $\mathbb{R}^2$ case or the no-slip condition on u in the bounded domain case and using the divergence-free condition we see:

$$\int u \cdot \nabla y \rho = 0.$$

This implies, on the one hand, that:

$$\int u_2 \rho = 0$$

On the other hand, if we take the equation

$$u + \nabla p = (0, \rho)$$

and dot with u we see (after an integration by parts and using the boundary conditions)

$$\int u_2 \rho = \int |u|^2.$$

Thus, $u \equiv 0$. As a result, $\rho_x \equiv 0$ and the lemma is proved. □

Although, as far as active scalar equations go, this system of equations shares many similarities with the surface quasi-geostrophic equation and the 2D Euler

equations, the IPM system has a very simple structure of stationary solutions. It turns out, in addition, that the linearized IPM equation around any one of these steady states has a special structure which allows us to deduce (in a relatively easy fashion) results on the long time behavior of perturbations of stationary solutions.

Recall that $\rho = f(y)$ and $u = 0$ are the stationary solutions of this system. Now suppose that we perturb the data a little bit: $\rho = f(y) + \tilde{\rho}$ and $v = \tilde{v}$. Then we see:

$$\tilde{v} = -\nabla p + (0, \tilde{\rho})$$

and

$$\partial_t \tilde{\rho} + (\tilde{v}) \cdot \nabla (f(y) + \tilde{\rho}) = 0.$$

Now we rewrite $\tilde{v}$ as v and $\tilde{\rho}$ as ρ and simplify:

$$(1.4) \quad v = -\nabla p + (0, \rho)$$

$$\partial_t \rho + v_2 f'(y) + v \cdot \nabla \rho = 0$$

It is clear that under the no-slip boundary condition ($u \cdot n = 0$) and under the assumption that the domain is simply connected, we may pass to the stream function formulation where we define $u = \nabla^\perp \psi$:

$$\Delta \psi = -\partial_x \rho$$

and $\psi = 0$ on the boundary of the domain.

This implies that $v_2 = R\rho$ where $R = \partial_{xx}(-\Delta)^{-1}$. Here, $(-\Delta)^{-1}$ is the inverse of the Dirichlet Laplacian.

Thus, our equation reads:

$$(1.5) \quad \partial_t \rho + f'(y)R\rho + v \cdot \nabla \rho = 0$$

What is interesting about this equation is that R is a negative operator so we get a mild dissipation effect.

This structure will allow us to prove stability.

Theorem 1.2. *(Main Result on $\mathbb{R}^2$)*

Let $\Omega(y) := y$. There exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that if we solve IPM with initial data $\rho_0 + \Omega$ with $|\rho_0|_{X^s} \leq \epsilon_0 \leq \epsilon$, $s \geq 20$ then the solution ρ satisfies the following:

$$(1) |\rho(t) - \Omega|_{H^3} \lesssim \frac{\epsilon}{t^{1/4}} \quad \forall t > 0,$$

$$(2) |u_1|_{H^3} \lesssim \frac{\epsilon}{t^{3/4}},$$

$$(3) |u_2|_{H^3} \lesssim \frac{\epsilon}{t^{5/4}},$$

where $u = R_1 R^\perp \rho$.

Theorem 1.3. *(Main Result on $\mathbb{T}^2$)*

The stationary solution Ω of the IPM equation is asymptotically stable in H^s for $s > 1$. In other words, there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that if we solve IPM with initial data $\rho_0 + \Omega$ with $|\rho_0|_{H^s} \leq \epsilon_0$ then the solution $\tilde{\rho}$ satisfies the following:

$$(1) |\rho(t) - \Omega|_{H^4} \leq 2\epsilon \quad \forall t > 0$$

$$(2) |u|_{H^3} \leq \epsilon t^{-2.5}$$

Remark 1.4. We note here that ρ will never belong to H^4 (or even L^2) in the whole space case. However, if we perturb ρ by an H^s function the perturbation will remain H^s for all time (unless the solution blows up in finite time). Similarly, ρ is not periodic but we may perturb it by a periodic function and once more the perturbation will remain periodic. Note also that in the $\mathbb{R}^2$ case, ρ itself will decay (though mildly); however, in the $\mathbb{T}^2$ case, ρ will not decay. Note that an easy consequence of Theorem 1.3 is that the x -derivatives of ρ decay algebraically whereas the y derivatives need not decay at all. Indeed, if we perturb the stationary solution by a function of y only then there should be no decay!

1.5. Comparison with other results. The idea of taking a non-linear equation where global well-posedness is unknown and proving global well-posedness of a perturbation of the equation is not new. Very recently, this was done for the MHD equation by Lin and Zhang [21] and has also been done for complex fluids in other contexts as well ([7],[23]).

We emphasize here that the kind of damping that the linearized equation gives us:

$$g_t = R(g)$$

with $R = R_1^2$ does not seem to have been considered in other works. Indeed, this sort of linearized equation gives damping only in the x -direction which may not be strong enough, in general, to control non-linear terms. In our case, however, due to the structure of the non-linearity in the IPM equation (the fact that each term in the non-linearity has *two* x -derivatives), we are able to control the non-linearity well enough to prove decay of the velocity field. This anisotropy was also present in the work of Bedrossian and Masmoudi [1].

In the class of smooth solutions, this seems to be the first global well-posedness result for a supercritical and invscid active scalar equation. Another notable result in the class of vortex-patch type solutions is that of Hmidi and Hassainia [16]. They prove global existence and uniqueness of a certain kind of “periodically-rotating” vortex patch for a class of supercritical active scalar equations. This was subsequently improved to a broader class of models (including the SQG equation) by Cordoba et al. [4]. In the class of weaker solutions, Isett and Vicol [17] were able to use convex integration to construct global weak solutions to the IPM equation which are of class $C_{t,x}^{\frac{1}{9}}$. Unfortunately, as is established by Isett and Vicol, these solutions are highly non-unique. A slightly different class of results were recently attained by a number of authors ([5],[8],[6]) on the Muskat problem which can be seen as the “free boundary problem” for the IPM equations.

We close by mentioning that in [17],[13], and [15], [14] the authors indicate a difference between active scalars where the operator relating the velocity field and the advected quantity (u and ρ in our case), has an even Fourier symbol or an odd Fourier symbol. We are taking advantage of the fact that, for the IPM equation, this symbol is even and one component of it has a sign. Such a thing can never happen if the symbol is odd; however, in [12] the authors establish certain dispersive properties of equations of the form $f_t = R_1(f)$ which can also act as a stabilizing force. It is possible that using this sort of dispersion, one can say something about stationary solutions for active scalar equations with odd symbol.

1.6. The ideas behind the proofs. The proofs of Theorems 1.2 and 1.3 are of a very different nature. In the whole space case (Theorem 1.2), if we solve the linearized problem ρ itself decays at the rate of $t^{-\frac{1}{4}}$, u_1 decays at a rate of $t^{-3/4}$, and u_2 decays at a rate of $t^{-5/4}$. It is somewhat inconcievable that such slow decay rates can control a *general* quadratic non-linearity. However, it turns out that if we analyze the nonlinear term:

$$u \cdot \nabla \rho = (-R_1 R_2 \rho, R_1^2 \rho) \cdot \nabla \rho,$$

then we will notice that each term of the nonlinearity contains *two* x-derivatives which allows us to prove that the energy will be controlled so long as ∇u_2 is controlled, and as stated above u_2 decays like $t^{-5/4}$ this is done in subsection 3.1. So we can control the energy so long as we can bootstrap a decay of $t^{-5/4}$. Bootstrapping the decay of u_2 is non-trivial due to the fact that ρ itself decays very slowly. Nevertheless, in subsections 3.2 and 3.3 we are able to prove (with a great loss of derivatives) that so long as ρ is bounded in a high energy space u_2 decays like $t^{-5/4}$.

The result on the torus (Theorem 1.3) is very different for the main reason that ρ itself does not decay. This is because all functions of y are stationary solutions of our equation. On the other hand, the linearized equation gives very good decay properties for u *so long as* we are willing to lose derivatives (Proposition 2.7). A loss of derivatives in the linearized decay estimate along with the fact that there are non-decaying modes in the equation makes it nearly impossible to propagate decay unless we are willing to work in super-smooth spaces (Gevrey-Sobolev spaces). Indeed, the non-decaying mode will actually introduce a *new* linear term into the equation which could, potentially, change the decay properties of the linearized problem. We get around this problem by proving that the decay properties of the linear semi-group $e^{R_1^2 t}$ are actually stable in a certain sense—see section 4 for more details.

1.7. Organization of the Paper. In the next section we will study some properties of stationary solutions as well as properties of the linear equation

$$\partial_t \rho = -f'(y) R \rho.$$

In Section 3 we will prove Theorem 1.1. In sections 4 and 5 we will prove Theorem 1.2.

2. LINEARIZED EQUATION AND LINEARIZED DECAY

We begin by proving the following stability theorem under certain monotonicity conditions on the stable solution:

Proposition 2.1. *If $f' \geq K$ and $f''' \leq 0$ then*

$$(2.1) \quad -(f'(y)Rg, g) \geq K|R_1g|_{L^2}^2 \quad \forall g \in L^2$$

If $f' \geq K$ and $|f_+'''(x)|_{L^\infty} < 2\pi^2 K$, then:

$$(2.2) \quad (f'(y)R(g), g) \geq \left(K - \frac{|f_+'''(x)|_{L^\infty}}{2\pi^2}\right)|Rg|_{L^2}^2, \quad \forall g \in L^2(\mathbb{T}^2).$$

Here, f_+''' denotes the positive part of the third derivative of f .

Remark 2.2. Note that the relaxation of the assumptions on f given in the second part of the proposition can be made if the functions g are restricted to a domain where the Poincaré inequality holds.

Proof. We want to study

$$(f'(y)Rg, g).$$

Therefore, we let $g = -\Delta\phi$.

Then,

$$(f'(y)Rg, g) = (f'(y)\phi_{xx}, \phi_{xx} + \phi_{yy}) \geq K|\phi_{xx}|_{L^2}^2 + (f'(y)\phi_{xx}, \phi_{yy}).$$

Now,

$$\begin{aligned} (f'(y)\phi_{xx}, \phi_{yy}) &= -(f'(y)\phi_x, \phi_{xyy}) = (f'(y)\phi_{xy}, \phi_{xy}) + (f''(y)\phi_x, \phi_{xy}) \\ &= (f'(y)\phi_{xy}, \phi_{xy}) - \frac{1}{2}(f'''(y)\phi_x, \phi_x). \end{aligned}$$

Putting all this together, and using that $f''' \leq 0$ we see:

$$(f'(y)Rg, g) \geq K(|\phi_{xx}|^2 + |\phi_{xy}|^2) = K|\nabla\phi_x|^2 = K|\Lambda\phi_x|^2 = K|R_1g|^2.$$

This concludes the proof of the first part of Proposition 3.1. For the second part, we simply note that

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^2} |\phi_x|^2 \leq \frac{1}{\pi^2} \int_{\mathbb{T}^2} |\nabla \phi_x|^2$$

□

Some examples of stationary solutions satisfying the assumptions of Proposition 3.1 are:

- (1) Linear: $\rho(y) = Ky + b$, $K > 0$
- (2) Linear plus periodic: $\rho(y) = Ky + \sin(y)$, $K > \frac{3}{2}$.

2.1. Linear Decay on $\mathbb{T}^2$. Our goal is to prove that if ρ satisfies the linear problem:

$$\partial_t \rho = R_1^2 \rho,$$

then $u = R_1 R^\perp \rho$ decays in time. Using the Fourier transform, we may solve this equation exactly as:

$$\hat{\rho}(t, n) = e^{-\frac{n_1^2}{n_1^2 + n_2^2} t} \hat{\rho}_0(n)$$

Now, it is clear that when $n_1 = 0$ there is no decay. However, the operator R_1 kills terms with $n_1 = 0$. Indeed,

$$R_1 \hat{\rho}(t, n) = -i \frac{n_1}{|n|} e^{-\frac{n_1^2}{n_1^2 + n_2^2} t} \hat{\rho}_0(n).$$

Hence, by Plancharel's theorem:

$$|u|_{L^2} = |R_1 \rho|_{L^2} \leq \sum_{n_1 \neq 0} e^{-\frac{n_1^2}{n_1^2 + n_2^2} t} |\hat{\rho}_0(n)|^2 \leq \sum_{n_1 \neq 0} e^{-\frac{1}{n_1^2 + n_2^2} t} |\hat{\rho}_0(n)|^2$$

Now we write:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n_1 \neq 0} e^{-\frac{1}{n_1^2 + n_2^2} t} |\hat{\rho}_0(n)|^2 &\leq e^{-\frac{t}{K^2}} |\rho_0|_{L^2} + \sum_{|n| \geq K} |\hat{\rho}_0(n)|^2 \\ &\leq e^{-\frac{t}{K^2}} |\rho_0|_{L^2} + K^{-2s} |\rho_0|_{H^s}^2 \end{aligned}$$

Now, we want u to decay, say in H^{2+} , like $t^{-2-\delta}$ for some $\delta > 0$. This will be achieved if we take $s > 2$ and $K = t^{0.5-\epsilon}$ for some $\epsilon > 0$. Therefore, for each $\epsilon > 0$,

$$(2.3) \quad |u|_{H^{2+\epsilon}} \leq \frac{1}{t^{2+\delta}} |\rho_0|_{H^{4+2\epsilon}}.$$

2.2. Linear Decay on $\mathbb{R}^2$. Because the spectrum of the Laplacian is continuous on $\mathbb{R}^2$, we cannot apply the ideas from the $\mathbb{T}^2$ case here. However, it turns out that we can still say something.

Consider the linear equation:

$$\partial_t \rho = R_1^2 \rho.$$

Then,

$$\hat{\rho}(t, \xi) = e^{-\frac{\xi_1^2}{\xi_1^2 + \xi_2^2} t} \hat{\rho}_0(\xi_1, \xi_2).$$

Thus,

$$|\rho|_{L^2}^2 = |\hat{\rho}|_{L^2}^2 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^{-\frac{\xi_1^2}{\xi_1^2 + \xi_2^2} t} |\hat{\rho}_0(\xi_1, \xi_2)|^2 d\xi_1 d\xi_2.$$

Now let's transform this integral into an integral in polar coordinates.

Then we have:

$$\begin{aligned} |\hat{\rho}|_{L^2}^2 &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^{-\frac{\xi_1^2}{\xi_1^2 + \xi_2^2} t} |\hat{\rho}_0(\xi_1, \xi_2)|^2 d\xi_1 d\xi_2 = \int_0^{2\pi} \int_0^\infty e^{-\cos^2(\theta)t} |\hat{\rho}_0(\theta, r)|^2 r dr d\theta \\ &= \int_0^{2\pi} e^{-\cos^2(\theta)t} G_0(\theta) d\theta. \end{aligned}$$

We now use the following calculus lemma.

Lemma 2.3.

$$\int_0^{2\pi} |\cos(\theta)|^k e^{-\cos^2(\theta)t} d\theta \approx c_k t^{-(1+k)/2} \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow \infty$$

The proof of this lemma is simple and basically comes down to localizing to the region where $|\cos(\theta)|$ is small which consists of the region $|\theta - \frac{\pi}{2}| << 1$ and the region $|\theta - \frac{3\pi}{2}| << 1$. A suitable transformation yields that the integral above is approximately

$$\int_{-1}^1 |x|^k e^{-x^2 t} dx \approx \frac{c_k}{\sqrt{t^{k+1}}}$$

for some constant c_k .

Now, with Lemma 2.3 at hand, we see that

$$|\hat{\rho}|_{L^2} \lesssim \frac{1}{\sqrt{t}} |G_0|_{L^\infty([0, 2\pi])}.$$

On the other hand,

$$G_0(\theta) = \int_0^\infty |\hat{\rho}(\theta, r)|^2 r dr.$$

Assuming $\rho_0 \in W^{1+\delta, 1}$ we have that:

$$|\hat{\rho}_0(\theta, r)| \leq \frac{|\rho_0|_{W^{1+\delta}}}{r^{1+\delta} + 1}.$$

Hence,

$$|G|_{L^\infty} \lesssim |\rho_0|_{W^{1+\delta, 1}}^2$$

Thus we arrive that the following proposition:

Proposition 2.4. *Let $\rho_0 \in W^{1+\delta, 1}$ for some $\delta > 0$. If*

$$\hat{\rho}(t, \xi) = e^{-\frac{\xi_1^2}{\xi_1^2 + \xi_2^2} t} \hat{\rho}_0(\xi_1, \xi_2),$$

then,

$$(2.4) \quad |\rho|_{L^2} \lesssim \frac{|\rho_0|_{W^{1+\delta, 1}}}{(t+1)^{1/4}}.$$

Moreover,

$$(2.5) \quad |R_1 \rho|_{L^2} \lesssim \frac{|\rho_0|_{W^{1+\delta, 1}}}{(t+1)^{3/4}},$$

and

$$(2.6) \quad |R_1^2 \rho|_{L^2} \lesssim \frac{|\rho_0|_{W^{1+\delta, 1}}}{(t+1)^{5/4}}.$$

Unfortunately, estimates (2.4)-(2.6) have losses of derivatives in them; it would be optimal to be able to get an estimate on ρ in L^2 in a way which doesn't lose derivatives.

We can, at the expense of time decay, prove the following:

Proposition 2.5. *Let $\rho_0 \in L^2$.*

If $\hat{\rho}(\xi, t) = e^{-\frac{\xi_1^2}{|\xi|^2}t} \hat{\rho}_0(\xi)$, then,

$$(2.7) \quad |\rho|_{L^2} \leq |\rho_0|_{L^2}$$

$$(2.8) \quad |R_1 \rho|_{L^2} \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{t+1}} |\rho_0|_{L^2}$$

$$(2.9) \quad |R_1^2 \rho|_{L^2} \leq \frac{1}{t+1} |\rho_0|_{L^2}$$

Proof. The proofs of (2.7)-(2.9) are a direct consequence of the following pointwise inequality:

$$(2.10) \quad \left| e^{-A^2 t} A^k \right| \leq \frac{C_k}{(t+1)^{k/2}}$$

for $|A| \leq 1$.

We will prove (2.8) only as (2.6)-(2.7) are similar:

$$|R_1 \rho|_{L^2}^2 = \int e^{-\frac{\xi_1^2}{|\xi|^2}t} \left| \frac{\xi_1}{|\xi|} \right|^4 |\hat{\rho}(\xi_1, \xi_2)|^2 d\xi_1 d\xi_2.$$

Now (2.9) follows from inequality (2.10) applied with $A = \frac{\xi_1}{|\xi|}$.

□

We will need both Proposition 2.4 and Proposition 2.5 to prove Theorem 1.1.

Proposition 2.6. *Estimates (2.4)-(2.9) are sharp in the sense that there exist Schwartz functions $e^{R_1^2 t} f_i$ decays in L^2 just as dictated in the inequalities.*

Proof. We only give the proof for (2.4) and (2.7), the others being similar.

For (2.4) we can take any radial function f . Recall that the Fourier transform of a radial function is radial. Then we have:

$$|e^{R_1^2 t} f|_{L^2}^2 = \int_0^{2\pi} \int e^{-2\cos^2(\theta)t} |\hat{f}(r)|^2 r dr d\theta = |f|_{L^2}^2 \int_0^{2\pi} e^{-\cos^2(\theta)t} d\theta.$$

Hence, for any radial function f ,

$$|e^{R_1^2 t} f|_{L^2} \approx (1+t)^{-\frac{1}{4}} |f|_{L^2}.$$

This shows that (2.4) is sharp.

Showing that (2.7) is sharp requires that we construct a sequence of functions which more and more (in Fourier space) along $\xi_1 = 0$. Indeed, by the dominated convergence theorem $|e^{R_1^2 t} f|_{L^2}^2 \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ for any $f \in L^2$. The point is to take a sequence of f 's depending on t for which $|f_t|_{L^2}^2 = 1$ and $|e^{R_1^2 t} f_t|_{L^2} \not\rightarrow 0$.

Since we are working in L^2 we can look purely in Fourier space and we define $\phi(\xi_1, \xi_2) = \psi_t(\theta)g(r)$.

Then we take $\phi = \hat{f}$. Note that $f \in L^2$ if and only if $rg \in L^2(0, \infty)$ and $\psi_t \in L^2(0, 2\pi)$.

$$|e^{R_1^2 t} f|_{L^2}^2 = C_g \int_0^{2\pi} e^{-\cos^2(\theta)t} |\psi_t(\theta)|^2 d\theta.$$

Now we take

$$\psi_t = \sqrt{t+1} \chi_{[\pi/2 - \frac{1}{t+1}, \pi/2 + \frac{1}{t+1}]}.$$

Then we get:

$$|e^{R_1^2 t} f_t|_{L^2}^2 = C_f(t+1) \int_{\pi/2 - \frac{1}{t+1}}^{\pi/2 + \frac{1}{t+1}} e^{-\cos^2(\theta)t} d\theta \geq C_g(t+1) \int_{\pi/2 - \frac{1}{t+1}}^{\pi/2 + \frac{1}{t+1}} e^{-1} d\theta \geq c.$$

This implies that

$$|e^{R_1^2 t} f|_{L^2 \rightarrow L^2} \geq c$$

where c is independent of t .

□

2.3. Linear decay on the Torus in more generality. Consider the following linear equation

$$(2.11) \quad \partial_t \rho = R_1^2 \rho (1 - G(y, t)).$$

We wish to prove linear decay estimates for this equation assuming that G is sufficiently small and the initial data ρ_0 is such that $\tilde{\rho}_0 := \int \rho_0(x, y) dx \equiv 0$.

Proposition 2.7. *There exists $\delta > 0$ such that if $|G|_{W^{11,\infty}} \leq \delta$ for all time, then, if $e^{Lt}\rho_0$ denotes the solution of equation (2.11) with initial data such that $\tilde{\rho}_0 \equiv 0$, then*

$$(2.12) \quad |e^{Lt}\rho_0|_{H^8} \lesssim \frac{|\rho_0|_{H^{10}}}{(1+t)^{5/2}}, \quad \forall t \geq 0.$$

Remark 2.8. The proof of this proposition is not as trivial as its counterpart when $G \equiv 0$. Indeed, because of the presence of the term $G(y, t)$ in (2.11), we cannot extract an exact formula for the solution because the G term mixes the effect of all the Fourier coefficients while the operator R_1^2 is a Fourier multiplier.

Proof. First note

$$\partial_t \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \rho(t, x, y) dx = \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} R_1^2 \rho (1 - G(y)) dy = \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \partial_x (-\Delta)^{-1} \partial_x \rho (1 - G(y)) dx \equiv 0,$$

hence, if $\tilde{\rho}_0 \equiv 0$ then $\tilde{\rho}(t) \equiv 0$.

Upon multiplying (2.11) by ρ and integrating we see:

$$\partial_t |\rho|_{L^2}^2 = 2 \int R_1^2 \rho (1 - G) \rho.$$

Since $\tilde{\rho} \equiv 0$ we can write $\rho = \Delta \psi$. And we get:

$$\partial_t |\rho|_{L^2}^2 = -2 \int \partial_{xx} \psi (1 - G) \Delta \psi = 2 \int \partial_x \psi (1 - G) \partial_x \Delta \psi.$$

$$= -2 \int \nabla (\partial_x \psi (1 - G)) \cdot \nabla \partial_x \psi = -2 \int |\nabla \partial_x \psi|^2 (1 - G) + \int \partial_x \psi \nabla G \cdot \nabla \partial_x \psi.$$

Now, assuming that $|G|_{H^1} \leq \delta \ll 1$ and applying the Poincaré inequality we get:

$$\partial_t |\rho|_{L^2}^2 \leq - \int |\nabla \partial_x \psi|^2 = - \int |R_1 \psi|^2.$$

This yields that $|\rho|_{L^2}$ is bounded by its initial data.

In fact, due to the fact that the Laplacian has discrete spectrum on $\mathbb{T}^2$ we can actually deduce that ρ decays in L^2 so long as its higher derivatives are controlled. Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_t |\rho|_{L^2}^2 &\leq - \sum_{n,k} \frac{n^2}{n^2 + k^2} |\rho_{n,k}|^2 \leq - \sum_{n,k} \frac{1}{n^2 + k^2} |\rho_{n,k}|^2 \\
&\leq - \frac{1}{N} |\rho|_{L^2}^2 + \sum_{n^2+k^2>N} \left(\frac{1}{N} - \frac{1}{n^2 + k^2} \right) |\rho_{n,k}|^2 \leq \frac{1}{N} \left(- |\rho|_{L^2}^2 + \sum_{n^2+k^2>N} |\rho_{n,k}|^2 \right) \\
&\leq - \frac{1}{N} |\rho|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{1}{N^5} \sum_{n^2+k^2>N} (n^2 + k^2)^2 |\rho_{n,k}|^2 \leq - \frac{1}{N} |\rho|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{|\rho|_{H^2}^2}{N^5}.
\end{aligned}$$

Now take $N = \sqrt{t+1}$.

This gives:

$$\partial_t |\rho|_{L^2}^2 \leq - \frac{|\rho|_{L^2}^2}{\sqrt{t+1}} + \frac{|\rho|_{L_t^\infty H_x^2}^2}{(t+1)^{5/2}}.$$

Lemma 2.9. *Let f be a positive C^1 function of t .*

Suppose that

$$\partial_t f \leq - \frac{f}{\sqrt{t+1}} + \frac{A}{(t+1)^{5/2}}$$

for some $A > 0$.

Then,

$$f(t) \leq \frac{f(0) + A}{(t+1)^{5/2}}$$

Proof.

$$\partial_t (e^{2\sqrt{t+1}} f) \leq \frac{A e^{2\sqrt{t+1}}}{(t+1)^{5/2}}$$

So,

$$f(t) \leq e^{-2\sqrt{t+1}} f(0) + \int_0^t \frac{A e^{2(\sqrt{s+1}-\sqrt{t+1})}}{(s+1)^{5/2}} ds.$$

The Lemma follows after we split the integral into two pieces: from 0 to t and $t/2$ to t . The integral from 0 to $t/2$ decays exponentially. The second part of the integral decays like $(t+1)^{-5/2}$ multiplied by the factor:

$$\int_{t/2}^t e^{2(\sqrt{s+1}-\sqrt{t+1})} ds = \int_0^{\sqrt{t+1}-\sqrt{t/2+1}} 2\tau e^{-\tau} d\tau < C.$$

This completes the proof of the Lemma.

□

Now applying Lemma 2.8 we see that

$$|\rho|_{L^2} \leq \frac{|\rho|_{L^\infty([0,t];H^2)}}{(t+1)^{5/2}}.$$

The idea is then to show that $|\rho(t)|_{H^2} \leq |\rho_0|$ and then this would give (2.12) with H^8 replaced by L^2 and H^{10} replaced by L^2 . We won't show this step as it will be clear from the H^8 estimate.

Now we wish to prove a similar decay estimate for the higher derivatives.

First we will prove $|e^{Lt}\rho|_{H^{10}} \leq |\rho_0|_{H^{10}}$. Define $J := (-\Delta + 1)$. Indeed,

$$\partial_t \frac{1}{2} |\rho|_{H^{10}}^2 = \sum_{|s| \leq 10} \int \partial^s \left(R_1^2 \rho (1 - G) \right) \partial^s \rho = \sum_{|s| \leq 10} \int \partial^s \left(\partial_{xx} \psi (1 - G) \right) \Delta \partial^s \psi$$

with $\Delta \psi = \rho$ as above.

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t |\rho|_{H^{10}}^2 &= \sum_{|s| \leq 10} \int \partial^s \left(\partial_x \psi (1 - G) \right) \Delta \partial^s \partial_x \psi \\ &= \sum_{|s| \leq 10} \int (1 - G) \partial^s \partial_x \psi \Delta \partial^s \partial_x \psi + \sum_{i=1}^{|s|} c_{i,s} \int \partial^{s-i} \partial_x \psi \partial^i G \Delta \partial^s \partial_x \psi \\ &= - \sum_{|s| \leq 10} \int (1 - G) |\partial^s \partial_x \nabla \psi|^2 + \int \partial^s \partial_x \psi \nabla G \cdot \nabla \partial^s \partial_x \psi + \sum_{i=1}^{|s|} c_{i,s} \int \nabla \left(\partial^{s-i} \partial_x \psi \partial^i G \right) \cdot \nabla \partial^s \partial_x \psi \\ &\leq -\frac{3}{4} |R_1 \rho|_{H^{10}}^2 + C |G|_{W^{11,\infty}} |R_1 \rho|_{H^{10}}^2 \end{aligned}$$

now if $|G|_{W^{11,\infty}}$ is small enough we see:

$$\partial_t |\rho|_{H^{10}}^2 \leq -|R_1 \rho|_{H^{10}}^2$$

which implies that $|\rho|_{H^{10}}$ is uniformly bounded by its initial value:

$$|\rho|_{H^{10}}^2 \leq |\rho_0|_{H^{10}}^2.$$

By the same token,

$$\partial_t |\rho|_{H^8}^2 \leq -|R_1 \rho|_{H^8}^2.$$

Arguing as we did above when we proved the L^2 decay, we get:

$$|\rho|_{H^8} \leq \frac{|\rho_0|_{H^{10}}}{(1+t)^{5/2}}.$$

This concludes the proof of Proposition 2.6. □

2.4. A Basic Lemma. The following basic lemma will be needed throughout the paper.

Lemma 2.10. *Let $\delta > 0$ and $\eta > 0$.*

Then,

$$(2.13) \quad \int_0^t \frac{ds}{(t-s+1)^\delta (s+1)^{1+\eta}} \leq \frac{C_{\eta,\delta}}{(t+1)^\delta}$$

Proof. Case 1: $\delta \neq 1$.

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^{t/2} \frac{ds}{(t-s+1)^\delta (s+1)^{1+\eta}} &\leq \frac{1}{(t/2+1)^\delta} \int_0^{t/2} \frac{ds}{(s+1)^{1+\eta}} = \frac{1}{\eta(t/2+1)^\delta} \\ \int_{t/2}^t \frac{ds}{(t-s+1)^\delta (s+1)^{1+\eta}} &\leq \frac{1}{(t/2+1)^{1+\eta}} \int_{t/2}^t \frac{ds}{(t-s+1)^\delta} \\ &= \frac{1}{(t/2+1)^{1+\eta}} \int_0^{t/2} \frac{ds}{(s+1)^\delta} = \frac{1}{1-\delta} \frac{1}{(t/2+1)^{1+\eta}} ((t/2+1)^{1-\delta} - 1) \\ &\lesssim C_\delta \frac{1}{(t/2+1)^{\delta+\eta}} \end{aligned}$$

This completes Case 1.

When $\delta = 1$ we simply get:

$$\int_{t/2}^t \frac{ds}{(t-s+1)^\delta (s+1)^{1+\eta}} \leq \frac{\text{Log}(t/2+1)}{(t/2+1)^{1+\eta}} \leq \frac{c}{1+t}.$$

This concludes the proof of 2.11. □

3. THE PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1

We begin by proving special energy estimates which allow us to say that we can prove that the H^s norms of ρ remain small so long as the ∇u_2 decays fast enough.

Notice that in most cases with a transport equation, we need fast decay of the gradient the whole velocity field, ∇u , in order to control the equation. We will use a special structure of the nonlinearity to prove that only decay on ∇u_2 is needed.

3.1. Energy Estimates.

Lemma 3.1. *The following estimate holds for $s \geq 4$.*

$$(3.1) \quad \partial_t |\rho|_{H^s}^2 \leq C \left(|\nabla u_2|_{L^\infty} |\rho|_{H^s}^2 + |u|_{H^s}^2 |\rho|_{H^s} \right) - \frac{1}{2} |u|_{H^s}^2.$$

Remark 3.2. A consequence of Lemma 3.1 is that if we have good (integrable) time decay on u_2 and its gradient, then we will be able to prove that $|\rho|_{H^s}$ remains uniformly bounded by 2ϵ so long as it starts out of size ϵ small enough. We will indeed prove this in the following subsection.

Proof. The usual method of using the Kato-Ponce inequality will only give us $|\rho|_{H^s}^2 |u|_{H^s}$ on the right hand side of the energy inequality. We will need to carry out the energy estimates carefully to ensure that the estimate of the nonlinear term is quadratic in u and this is why we will lose one derivative in the estimate.

We first want to make the following simple observations:

- (1) $|R_1 \rho|_{H^s} = |u|_{H^s}$.
- (2) $|\partial_x \rho|_{H^s} = |R_1 \Lambda \rho|_{H^s} = |R_1 \rho|_{H^{s+1}} = |u|_{H^{s+1}}$

We are interested in H^s estimates so we will focus on first controlling the non-linear term $u \cdot \nabla \rho$.

Step 1: The non-linear term

$$(\partial^s (u \cdot \nabla \rho), \partial^s \rho) = \sum_{i=1}^s a_{i,s} \left(\partial^i u \cdot \nabla \partial^{s-i} \rho, \partial^s \rho \right).$$

So we must study

$$\left(\partial^i u \cdot \nabla \partial^{s-i} \rho, \partial^s \rho \right),$$

for $1 \leq i \leq s$.

Using observation (1)-(2) above, it actually suffices to consider the term

$$\left(\partial^i \psi_x \partial^{s-i} \rho_y, \partial^s \rho \right),$$

where $u = \nabla^\perp \psi$. Now, we want to distinguish between two kinds of terms, first the case where $i = 1$ and then the case where $i \geq 2$.

The case $i = 1$.

This means that we study

$$(\partial \psi_x \partial^{s-1} \rho_y, \partial^s \rho).$$

We will estimate this term in two different ways (to get (2.7) and (2.8)).

One can estimate directly:

$$|(\partial \psi_x \partial^{s-1} \rho_y, \partial^s \rho)| \lesssim |\nabla u|_{L^\infty} |\rho|_{H^s}^2.$$

One can also do the following

$$(\partial \psi_x \partial^{s-1} \rho_y, \partial^s \rho) = -(\partial \psi \partial^{s-1} \rho_{xy}, \partial^s \rho) - (\partial \psi \partial^{s-1} \rho_y, \partial^s \rho_x).$$

We can now integrate by parts once more to get:

$$|(\partial \psi_x \partial^{s-1} \rho_y, \partial^s \rho)| \lesssim |\nabla u|_{L^\infty} |u|_{H^s} |\rho|_{H^{s+1}} \leq |u|_{H^s}^2 |\rho|_{H^{s+1}}.$$

This concludes this case.

The case $i \geq 2$.

We will study

$$(\partial^i \psi_x \partial^{s-i} \rho_y, \partial^s \rho).$$

Upon integrating by parts, we see:

$$(\partial^i \psi_x \partial^{s-i} \rho_y, \partial^s \rho) = -(\partial^i \psi \partial^{s-i} \rho_{xy}, \partial^s \rho) - (\partial^i \psi \partial^{s-i} \rho_y, \partial^s \rho_x) = I + II.$$

Now, it is clear that

$$|I| \lesssim |u|_{H^s}^2 |\rho|_{H^s}.$$

Moreover, by writing:

$$II = (\partial(\partial^i \psi \partial^{s-i} \rho_y), \partial^{s-1} \rho_x)$$

and noting that $i \leq 2$ we see:

$$|II| \lesssim |u|_{H^s}^2 |\rho|_{H^s}.$$

Step 2: The linear term

We are interested in studying

$$(\partial^s (f'(y)R\rho), \partial^s \rho).$$

This term is written as:

$$(\partial^s (f'(y)R\rho), \partial^s \rho) = (f'(y)\partial^s R\rho, \partial^s \rho) + III \geq K|u|_{H^s}^2 - |III|$$

where III consists of terms of the form $(\partial^{s_1} f'(y)\partial^{s_2} R\rho, \partial^s \rho)$ with $s_1 + s_2 = s$ and $s_1 \geq 1$. It is easy to see that

$$|III| \leq \frac{K}{2}|u|_{H^s}^2 + C|\rho|_{H^{s-1}}^2,$$

where C depends upon K and $|f'|_{W^{4,\infty}}$.

This concludes the proof of (2.5)-(2.6). □

3.2. Decay of $|\rho|_{H^5}$ and $|u_2|_{H^{10}}$. We will now prove the following proposition:

Proposition 3.3. *Assume that $|\rho|_{H^{20}} \leq 4\epsilon$ on the interval $[0, T]$. Then,*

$$(3.2) \quad |\rho|_{H^5} \lesssim \frac{\epsilon}{(t+1)^{\frac{1}{4}}},$$

and

$$(3.3) \quad |u_2|_{H^{10}} \lesssim \frac{\epsilon}{(t+1)},$$

for all $t \in [0, T]$.

The proof of (3.2) and (3.3) is somewhat delicate because there is a loss of derivatives in proving the decay estimate (2.6).

Proof. Using Duhamel's formula, we can write:

$$\rho(t) = e^{R_1^2 t} \rho_0 + \int_0^t e^{R_1^2(t-s)} (u \cdot \nabla \rho)(s) ds$$

Using (2.4) we see that:

$$|\rho|_{H^5} \leq \frac{C\epsilon}{(t+1)^{1/4}} + \int_0^t \frac{C}{(t-s+1)^{1/4}} |u \cdot \nabla \rho|_{W^{7,1}} ds.$$

We will need the following estimate:

Claim:

$$|u \cdot \nabla \rho|_{W^{7,1}} \leq C\sqrt{\epsilon} |u_2|_{H^{10}} \sqrt{|\rho|_{H^5}}.$$

Proof of the Claim:

$u \cdot \nabla \rho$ consists of two terms:

$$|u \cdot \nabla \rho|_{W^{7,1}} \leq C |u_1|_{H^7} |\partial_x \rho|_{H^7} + |u_2|_{H^7} |\partial_y \rho|_{H^7}$$

$$|u_1|_{L^2}^2 = \int R_1 R_2 \rho R_1 R_2 \rho = \int R_2 R_2 \rho R_1 R_1 \rho \leq |\rho|_{L^2} |R_1^2 \rho|_{L^2} = |\rho|_{L^2} |u_2|_{L^2}$$

Hence,

$$|u_1|_{H^7} \leq |\rho|_{H^7}^{1/2} |u_2|_{H^7}^{1/2}.$$

By the same token,

$$|\partial_x \rho|_{H^7} \leq |\rho|_{H^8}^{1/2} |u_2|_{H^8}^{1/2}.$$

Hence,

$$|u \cdot \nabla \rho|_{W^{7,1}} \leq C |u_2|_{H^8} |\rho|_{H^8}$$

However, due to the well-known interpolation inequalities,

$$|\rho|_{H^8}^2 \leq |\rho|_{H^5} |\rho|_{H^{13}}$$

which completes the proof of the claim since $|\rho|_{H^{13}} \leq 4\epsilon$.

Now with the claim at hand we see:

$$|\rho|_{H^5} \leq \frac{C\epsilon}{(t+1)^{1/4}} + \int_0^t \frac{C\sqrt{\epsilon}}{(t-s+1)^{1/4}} |u_2|_{H^{10}}(s) \sqrt{|\rho|_{H^5}(s)} ds.$$

Now let's estimate $|u_2|_{H^{10}}$ using estimate (2.8) which has no loss of derivatives, again, using the Duhamel formula:

$$|u_2|_{H^{10}} \leq \frac{C\epsilon}{(t+1)} + \int_0^t \frac{|u \cdot \nabla \rho|_{H^{10}}}{(t-s+1)}$$

We will need the following estimate:

Claim:

$$|u \cdot \nabla \rho|_{H^{10}} C\sqrt{\epsilon} |u_2|_{H^{10}} \sqrt{|\rho|_{H^5}}$$

Indeed, as before,

$$|u \cdot \nabla \rho|_{H^{10}} \leq C \left(|u_1|_{H^{10}} |\partial_x \rho|_{L^\infty} + |u_1|_{L^\infty} |\partial_x \rho|_{H^{10}} + |u_2|_{H^{10}} |\partial_y \rho|_{L^\infty} + |u_2|_{L^\infty} |\partial_y \rho|_{H^{10}} \right)$$

However,

$$|u_1|_{H^{10}} \leq |u_2|_{H^{10}}^{1/2} |\rho|_{H^{10}}^{1/2} \leq |u_2|_{H^{10}}^{1/2} \sqrt{\epsilon},$$

$$|\partial_x \rho|_{L^\infty} \leq |u_1|_{H^3} \leq |u_2|_{H^3}^{1/2} |\rho|_{H^3}^{1/2},$$

$$|u_1|_{L^\infty} \leq |u_1|_{H^2} \leq |u_2|_{H^2}^{1/2} |\rho|_{H^2}^{1/2},$$

$$|\partial_x \rho|_{H^{10}} \leq |u_1|_{H^{11}} \leq |u_2|_{H^{10}}^{1/2} |\rho|_{H^{12}}^{1/2},$$

and

$$|\partial_y \rho|_{H^{10}} \leq |\rho|_{H^5}^{1/2} |\rho|_{H^{17}}^{1/2}.$$

This completes the proof of the claim. □

Hence, we have:

$$(3.4) \quad |\rho|_{H^5} \leq \frac{C_* \epsilon}{(t+1)^{1/4}} + \int_0^t \frac{C\sqrt{\epsilon}}{(t-s+1)^{1/4}} |u_2|_{H^{10}}(s) \sqrt{|\rho|_{H^5}(s)} ds$$

and

$$(3.5) \quad |u_2|_{H^{10}} \leq \frac{C_* \epsilon}{(t+1)} + \int_0^t \frac{C\sqrt{\epsilon}}{(t-s+1)^{1/4}} |u_2|_{H^{10}}(s) \sqrt{|\rho|_{H^5}(s)} ds$$

for some fixed C_* .

A Continuity Argument:

Now, if we assume that

$$|\rho|_{H^5} \leq 4 \frac{C_* \epsilon}{(t+1)^{1/4}}$$

and

$$|u_2|_{H^5} \leq 4 \frac{C_* \epsilon}{(t+1)}$$

on an interval $[0, T^*]$ we will be able to apply inequality (2.11) to (3.4) and (3.5) to prove that, actually,

$$|\rho|_{H^5} \leq 2 \frac{C_* \epsilon}{(t+1)^{1/4}}$$

$$|u_2|_{H^{10}} \leq 2 \frac{C_* \epsilon}{(t+1)}$$

for all $t \in [0, T^*]$ and, by continuity, for all $t \in [0, T]$. This completes the proof of Proposition 3.3.

3.3. Integrable Decay on u_2 . With Proposition 3.3 at hand, we can now proceed to prove that u_2 decays at an integrable rate. This will allow us to close the energy estimate (3.1) and finish the proof.

Proposition 3.4. *Let $\rho_0 \in W^{5,1}$ with $|\rho_0| \leq \epsilon$. Then,*

$$(3.6) \quad |\nabla u_2|_{L^\infty} \lesssim \frac{\epsilon}{(1+t)^{5/4}}.$$

Proof. Using linear estimate (2.6) and the Duhamel formula, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} |u_2|_{H^{2.5}} &\lesssim \frac{\epsilon}{(t+1)^{5/4}} + \int_0^t \frac{|u \cdot \nabla \rho|_{W^{4,1}}(s)}{(t-s+1)^{5/4}} \\ &\leq \frac{\epsilon}{(t+1)^{5/4}} + \int_0^t \frac{|u_1|_{H^4}(s) |\partial_x \rho|_{H^4}(s) + |u_2|_{H^4}(s) |\partial_y|_{H^4}(s)}{(t-s+1)^{5/4}} ds \end{aligned}$$

However, using Proposition 3.3, we have:

$$|u|_{H^{2.5}} \lesssim \frac{\epsilon}{(t+1)^{5/4}} + \int_0^t \frac{\epsilon^2}{(t+s-1)^{5/4}(s+1)^{5/4}} ds.$$

Now we apply Lemma 2.6 and we have

$$|u|_{H^{2.5}} \lesssim \frac{\epsilon}{(t+1)^{5/4}}$$

□

3.4. Finishing off the proof. Using (3.6) and (3.1) we see that if ϵ is small enough, if we assume that $|\rho|_{H^{20}} \leq 4\epsilon$ on an interval of time $[0, T]$ while $|\rho_0|_{H^{20}} \leq \epsilon$, we actually have that $|\rho|_{H^{20}} \leq 2\epsilon$. This implies that $|\rho|_{H^{20}} \leq 2\epsilon$ for all time and we are done.

4. ASYMPTOTIC STABILITY ON THE TORUS

The proof of Theorem 1.2 is of a completely different nature when compared to the proof of Theorem 1.1. Indeed, in the $\mathbb{T}^2$ case, ρ itself cannot decay. Indeed, if $\rho_0 = g(y)$ then the solution is stationary. This causes a major difficulty in proving the global stability of $\rho(y) = y$. Indeed we will see that there are two major difficulties:

- (1) ρ itself cannot decay.
- (2) Proving that u decays fast enough requires a loss of derivatives.

The combination of these two difficulties has, in previous works, required that authors work in spaces with a high degree of smoothness in order to account for these two problems. Note that a loss of derivatives in the decay estimate is not itself destructive to standard methods of proving global stability—it is indeed the fact that ρ itself cannot decay that makes derivative losses problematic.

Indeed, as was outlined in the section on linear estimates, it is possible to prove the following linear decay estimate:

$$(4.1) \quad |e^{R_1^2 t} R_1 \rho|_{L^2} \lesssim \frac{1}{\sqrt{t+1}} |\rho|_{L^2}$$

and

$$(4.2) \quad |e^{R_1^2 t} R_1^2 \rho|_{L^2} \lesssim \frac{1}{t+1} |\rho|_{L^2}$$

This would imply, on a linear level, a decay on the order of t^{-1} for u_2 which, when coupled with the energy inequality (3.1) would almost give us global existence.

On the other hand, if one allows for an arbitrarily weak derivative loss, we can get integrable decay on u_2 .

$$|e^{R_1^2 t} R_1^2 \rho|_{L^2} \lesssim \frac{1}{(t+1)^{1+\epsilon}} |\rho|_{H^\epsilon}.$$

This derivative loss would seem to require that we close our estimates in a "super-smooth" space such as a Sobolev-Gevrey space. We, however, desire to prove a global stability result in Sobolev spaces.

4.1. Overcoming difficulties (1) and (2). Let's introduce some notation. Let $f : \mathbb{T}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a C^1 function. We define:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{f} &:= \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} f(x, y) dx, \\ \bar{f} &:= f - \tilde{f}. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that $\tilde{f}$ is always a function of y only.

It is expected that $\bar{\rho}$ will decay and $\tilde{\rho}$ will just remain bounded.

Now,

$$\partial_t \rho + u \cdot \nabla \rho = R_1^2 \rho.$$

Notice that $R_1^2 \rho = R_1^2 \bar{\rho}$ and $\bar{u} = u$.

So we can write:

$$\partial_t \bar{\rho} + \overline{u \cdot \nabla \rho} = R_1^2 \bar{\rho}$$

But

$$\overline{u \cdot \nabla \rho} = \overline{u \cdot \nabla \bar{\rho}} + \overline{u \cdot \nabla \tilde{\rho}} = \overline{u \cdot \nabla \bar{\rho}} + \overline{u_2 \partial_y \tilde{\rho}} = \overline{u \cdot \nabla \bar{\rho}} + u_2 \partial_y \tilde{\rho}$$

where the third equality is due to the fact that $\tilde{\rho}$ is a function of y only and the fourth equality is due to the fact that $u_2 = \bar{u}_2$ and $\tilde{\rho}$ is a function of y only.

Hence, the equation for $\bar{\rho}$ reads:

$$\partial_t \bar{\rho} + \overline{u \cdot \nabla \bar{\rho}} + u_2 \partial_y \tilde{\rho} = R_1^2 \bar{\rho}.$$

But since $u_2 = R_1^2 \rho$ we have:

$$(4.3) \quad \partial_t \bar{\rho} + \overline{u \cdot \nabla \bar{\rho}} = R_1^2 \bar{\rho} (1 - \partial_y \tilde{\rho})$$

and also the equation for $\tilde{\rho}$:

$$(4.4) \quad \partial_t \tilde{\rho} + \widetilde{\partial_y (u_2 \bar{\rho})} = 0$$

Our scheme for solving the problem will be as follows:

(A) Assume that $|\rho|_{H^{100}} \leq 4\epsilon$.

(B) (4.3) can be seen as a nonlinear perturbation of the equation studied in Proposition 2.7. Use Proposition 2.7 to prove that $\bar{\rho}$ decays integrably so long as (A) holds.

(C) Use energy estimate (3.1) to conclude.

5. THE PROOF OF THEOREM 1.2

Let $\rho_0 \in H^{20}$ be such that $|\rho_0|_{H^{20}} \leq \epsilon$ and suppose that $|\rho(t)|_{H^{20}} \leq 4\epsilon$ on a time interval $[0, T]$.

Then, the equation for $\bar{\rho}$ (4.3) reads:

$$\partial_t \bar{\rho} + u \cdot \nabla \bar{\rho} = L \bar{\rho}$$

with

$$L \bar{\rho} = R_1^2 \bar{\rho} (1 - \partial_y \tilde{\rho}).$$

By assumption, $\tilde{\rho}$ is small in H^{19} . This implies that L has nice decay properties.

Using Duhamel's principle we have:

$$\bar{\rho}(t) = e^{Lt} \rho_0 + \int_0^t e^{L(t-s)} \overline{u \cdot \nabla \bar{\rho}}(s) ds$$

By the linear decay estimates on L (Proposition 2.6) we know that that

$$\begin{aligned} |\bar{\rho}|_{H^{10}} &\lesssim \frac{\epsilon}{(t+1)^2} + \int_0^t \frac{1}{(t-s+1)^2} |u \cdot \nabla \bar{\rho}|_{H^{12}}(s) ds \\ &\lesssim \frac{\epsilon}{(1+t)^2} + \int_0^t \frac{1}{(t-s+1)^2} |\bar{\rho}|_{H^{10}}(s) |\rho|_{H^{13}}. \end{aligned}$$

So,

$$|\bar{\rho}|_{H^{10}}(t) \lesssim \frac{\epsilon}{(1+t)^2} + \int_0^t \frac{\epsilon}{(t-s+1)^2} |\bar{\rho}|_{H^{10}}(s) ds.$$

A simple bootstrap gives us that

$$|\bar{\rho}|_{H^{10}}(t) \lesssim \frac{\epsilon}{(1+t)^2}.$$

Now using the energy estimate (3.1) we are finished.

5.1. Asymptotic Stability on the Torus for A large class of stationary solutions. Combining the proof of Theorem 1.3, Proposition 2.1, and Proposition 2.7, it is actually possible to prove the following theorem:

Theorem 5.1. *Let $\Omega := Ky + \omega(y)$ be such that:*

- (A) ω is periodic
- (B) $\Omega' \geq c > 0$ for some $c > 0$.
- (C) $|\Omega_+'''|_{L^\infty} < \frac{c\pi^2}{2}$
- (D) $\omega \in W^{21,\infty}$.

Then, Ω is asymptotically stable in H^{20} in the sense of Theorem 1.2.

We leave the proof to the interested reader.

6. THE 3D CASE

In this section we investigate the corresponding IPM system in 3D:

$$(6.1) \quad u = \nabla p + (0, 0, \rho),$$

$$(6.2) \quad \partial_t \rho + u \cdot \nabla \rho = 0.$$

Proposition 6.1. *The only stationary solutions of (6.1)-(6.2) satisfying: $|u(x, y, z)| \lesssim \frac{1}{1+x^2+y^2+z^2}$ are such that ρ is a function of z only and $u \equiv 0$.*

The proof is exactly the same as the proof in the 2D case except we multiply (4.2) by z instead of y .

We focus upon the stationary solution $\rho(z) = z$. Since we have already completed the proof of this in 2d we will not reproduce it in 3d; we will only mention how the proof goes given the proof in the 2d case.

Henceforth, the equation we will consider is the perturbed equation:

$$(6.3) \quad u = \nabla p + (0, 0, \rho),$$

$$(6.4) \quad \partial_t \rho + u \cdot \nabla \rho = -u_3,$$

which corresponds to studying solutions of (4.1)-(4.2) which are of the form $\rho = \tilde{\rho} + z$.

Theorem 6.2. *There exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that for all $\rho_0 \in H^{20}$ with $|\rho_0|_{H^{20} \cap W^{5,1}} \leq \epsilon$, (4.3)-(4.4) has a global classical solution for which*

- (1) $|\rho|_{H^3} \lesssim \epsilon(1+t)^{-1/4}$,
 - (2) $|u_1|_{H^3} + |u_2|_{H^3} \lesssim \epsilon(1+t)^{-3/4}$,
 - (3) $|u_3|_{H^3} \lesssim \epsilon(1+t)^{-5/4}$,
- for all $t > 0$.

And on the torus:

Theorem 6.3. *Let $\Omega := Kz + \omega(z)$ be such that:*

- (A) ω is periodic
- (B) $\Omega' \geq c > 0$ for some $c > 0$.
- (C) $|\Omega_+'''|_{L^\infty} < \frac{c\pi^2}{2}$
- (D) $\omega \in W^{21,\infty}$.

Then, Ω is asymptotically stable in H^{20} in the sense of Theorem 1.2.

The proof is once more based upon linear decay estimates, careful energy estimates, and a bootstrap argument. We only give a sketch here.

6.1. Linear Estimates. The linear estimates, in both the torus and the whole space are basically the same as in the 2D case. Indeed,

$$|e^{(R_1^2 + R_2^2)t} \rho|_{L^2}^2 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} e^{-\frac{(\xi_1^2 + \xi_2^2)t}{|\xi|^2}} |\hat{f}(\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3)|^2 d\xi$$

switching to spherical coordinates:

$$\xi_1 = r \sin(\theta) \cos(\phi)$$

$$\xi_2 = r \sin(\theta) \sin(\phi)$$

$$\xi_3 = r \cos(\theta)$$

we see that the resulting integral is of the form:

$$\int e^{-\sin^2(\theta)t} |G(r, \phi, \theta)|^2 r \sin(\phi) dr d\phi d\theta.$$

Since $e^{-\sin^2(\theta)t}$ has basically the same properties as $e^{-\cos^2(\theta)t}$ we see that estimates (2.4)-(2.9) go straight through. The same happens in the periodic case as well.

6.2. Energy Estimates. Note that (similar to the 2d case)

$$-u_3 = R_1^2 \rho + R_2^2 \rho := L(\rho).$$

Notice that L damps in x and in y but not in z . Notice further that the nonlinearity $u \cdot \nabla \rho$ can be written as follows:

$$u \cdot \nabla \rho = R_1 R_3 \rho \rho_x + R_2 R_3 \rho \rho_y - (R_1^2 + R_2^2) \rho \rho_z$$

The crucial point is that each term in $u \cdot \rho$ has exactly two x or y derivatives. This will allow us to prove Lemma 3.1 in the 3D case and then apply the bootstrap argument. We leave the details to the reader.

7. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author acknowledges the support of an NSF Postdoctoral Research Fellowship. He also acknowledges helpful conversations with Jacob Bedrossian, Pierre Germain, and Nader Masmoudi.

REFERENCES

- [1] J. Bedrossian and N. Masmoudi. Inviscid damping and the asymptotic stability of planar shear flows in the 2d Euler equations. *ArXiv e-prints*, June 2013.
- [2] J. Bedrossian, N. Masmoudi, and C. Mouhot. Landau damping: paraproducts and Gevrey regularity. *ArXiv e-prints*, November 2013.
- [3] Luis A. Caffarelli and Alexis Vasseur. Drift diffusion equations with fractional diffusion and the quasi-geostrophic equation. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 171(3):1903–1930, 2010.

- [4] A. Castro, D. Córdoba, and J. Gómez-Serrano. Existence and regularity of rotating global solutions for the generalized surface quasi-geostrophic equations. *ArXiv e-prints*, September 2014.
- [5] Ángel Castro, Diego Córdoba, Charles Fefferman, and Francisco Gancedo. Breakdown of smoothness for the Muskat problem. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 208(3):805–909, 2013.
- [6] Ángel Castro, Diego Córdoba, Charles Fefferman, Francisco Gancedo, and María López-Fernández. Rayleigh-Taylor breakdown for the Muskat problem with applications to water waves. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 175(2):909–948, 2012.
- [7] Jean-Yves Chemin and Nader Masmoudi. About lifespan of regular solutions of equations related to viscoelastic fluids. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 33(1):84–112 (electronic), 2001.
- [8] Peter Constantin, Diego Córdoba, Francisco Gancedo, and Robert M. Strain. On the global existence for the Muskat problem. *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)*, 15(1):201–227, 2013.
- [9] Peter Constantin, Andrew J. Majda, and Esteban Tabak. Formation of strong fronts in the 2-D quasigeostrophic thermal active scalar. *Nonlinearity*, 7(6):1495–1533, 1994.
- [10] Peter Constantin and Vlad Vicol. Nonlinear maximum principles for dissipative linear nonlocal operators and applications. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 22(5):1289–1321, 2012.
- [11] P. G. Drazin. *Introduction to hydrodynamic stability*. Cambridge Texts in Applied Mathematics. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2002.
- [12] T.M. Elgindi and K. Widmayer. Sharp decay estimates for an anisotropic linear semigroup and applications to the sqg and inviscid boussinesq systems. *ArXiv e-prints*.
- [13] S. Friedlander, W. Rusin, and V. Vicol. The magneto-geostrophic equations: a survey. *ArXiv e-prints*, February 2013.
- [14] Susan Friedlander, Francisco Gancedo, Weiran Sun, and Vlad Vicol. On a singular incompressible porous media equation. *J. Math. Phys.*, 53(11):115602, 20, 2012.
- [15] Susan Friedlander, Walter Rusin, and Vlad Vicol. On the supercritically diffusive magneto-geostrophic equations. *Nonlinearity*, 25(11):3071–3097, 2012.
- [16] Z. Hassainia and T. Hmidi. On the inviscid Boussinesq system with rough initial data. *ArXiv e-prints*, February 2014.
- [17] P. Isett and V. Vicol. Holder Continuous Solutions of Active Scalar Equations. *ArXiv e-prints*, May 2014.
- [18] A. Kiselev. Regularity and blow up for active scalars. *Math. Model. Nat. Phenom.*, 5(4):225–255, 2010.
- [19] A. Kiselev, F. Nazarov, and A. Volberg. Global well-posedness for the critical 2D dissipative quasi-geostrophic equation. *Invent. Math.*, 167(3):445–453, 2007.
- [20] A. Kiselev and V. Sverak. Small scale creation for solutions of the incompressible two-dimensional euler equation. *Ann. of Math.*, 180(3):1205–1220, 2014.
- [21] Fanghua Lin and Ping Zhang. Global small solutions to an MHD-type system: the three-dimensional case. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 67(4):531–580, 2014.

- [22] Clément Mouhot and Cédric Villani. On Landau damping. *Acta Mathematica*, 207(1):29–201, 2011.
- [23] Xiaoxia Ren, Jiahong Wu, Zhaoyin Xiang, and Zhifei Zhang. Global existence and decay of smooth solution for the 2-D MHD equations without magnetic diffusion. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 267(2):503–541, 2014.
- [24] Serge Resnick. Dynamical problems in nonlinear advective partial differential equations. *PhD Thesis, University of Chicago*, 1995.